

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 9 and 13 being the independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicated that the electronic copies of the references submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 18, 2003 were not accessible from the disk submitted. Applicants are filing a paper copy of each of the cited references that were not previously considered by the Examiner in an Information Disclosure Statement herewith. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider each of the cited references.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because the drawings include a reference numeral not included in the description. Applicants have amended the specification to include the appropriate reference numeral. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,061,004 to Rosenberg (“the Rosenberg patent”).

Independent claim 1 and its dependent claims

Independent claim 1 recites “updating data values associated with *at least one of a displayed orientation and a displayed shape* of a graphical image in a graphical environment in relation to the sensed manipulation; and changing the relationship between the sensed

manipulation and the at least one of the displayed orientation and the displayed shape of the graphical image based on a simulated interaction of the graphical image with a graphical object.”

The Rosenberg patent discloses, among other things, a method and apparatus for providing force feedback including an indexing function. While the graphical object of the Rosenberg patent can move throughout the graphical user interface, there is no suggestion that the graphical object ever changes *orientation or shape*.

The Rosenberg patent does not teach or suggest that at least one of the “displayed orientation and the displayed shape” of the displayed graphical image is updated as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, the Rosenberg patent does not teach or suggest “changing the relationship between the sensed manipulation and the at least one of the displayed orientation and the displayed shape of the graphical image” of a graphical object as recited in independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also allowable over the cited reference.

Independent claim 9 and its dependent claims

Independent claim 9 recites “updating data values associated with at least one of a displayed orientation and a displayed shape of a graphical image in a graphical environment in relation to the sensed manipulation; and changing the relationship between the sensed manipulation and the at least one of the displayed orientation and the displayed shape of the graphical image by calculating at least one of the orientation and shape of the graphical image.”

As discussed above, the Rosenberg patent does not teach or suggest “updating data values associated with at least one of a displayed *orientation* and a displayed *shape* of a graphical image” as recited in independent claim 9. Moreover, the Rosenberg patent does not teach or

suggest “changing the relationship between the sensed manipulation and the at least one of the displayed orientation and the displayed shape of the graphical image [of an object]” as recited in independent claim 9. For at least these reasons, independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited references. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claim 9, dependent claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 10.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: September 16, 2003

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile

179599 v1/RE
3%KV01!.DOC